

REMARKS

The amendment does not involve new matter. The specification has been amended to correct minor typographical errors. Claim 28 has been amended to use language conforming to language in the specification, to make it clear that the spring rate is modified to bring it to within $\pm 2\%$ of a target spring rate. New claim 36 takes the language in the preamble of claim 28 and recites it as a positive limitation in the body of the claim..

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 28, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,057,072 (Cook). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 28 calls for a method of preparing a coil spring for use in a pressure relief valve and requires two steps:

- a) measuring the spring rate of the coil spring and;
- b) modifying the spring so as to modify its spring rate to be within $\pm 2\%$ of a target spring rate.

The Office Action takes the position that in Cook the spring rate is measured and “can be modified by removing a portion of the spring.” The Office Action cites col. 3, lines 30-40 for support. However, this section of Cook addresses the benefits of using conical spring washers. There is a discussion of removing or adding conical spring washers to provide a varying bias, but there is no teaching or suggestion in Cook to either measure the spring rate of any spring, let alone a coil spring as required by claim 28, or to removing a portion of the spring. There is a coil spring in Cook, spring 19, but there is no teaching or suggestion of measuring the rate of the coil spring, or modifying the rate of the coil spring. Claim 31 requires the spring rate to be modified by having a portion of the surface of the spring removed. Claim 33 requires the material be removed from the outside diameter of the coil spring. There is no teaching or suggestion in Cook of modifying a coil spring rate by having a portion of the surface of the coil spring removed, let alone removed from its outside diameter.

The Office Action states, “By removing a spring washer, material is removed from the outside diameter.” This statement is traversed. First, it is not seen how removing a spring washer would remove material from the outside diameter. More importantly, this has nothing to do with a coil spring, which is what claims 28, 31 and 33 require.

In short, Cook does suggest either of the steps required in claim 28, and therefore does not anticipate claim 28, let alone the further limitations in claims 31 and 33.

Finally, there is no suggestion in Cook of taking the coil spring, measuring its spring rate, modifying its spring rate, and then using the spring to make a pressure relief valve, as required by new claim 36.

Thus, all the claims under consideration in the application are allowable over the cited prior art. Further, since claim 28 is a generic claim, the allowability of claim 28 requires the species restriction to be withdrawn, and all claims dependent on claim 28 should be brought back into consideration and allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven P. Shurtz/

Steven P. Shurtz
Registration No. 31,424
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200
Direct Dial: (801) 444-3933